



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

me of the stations on the underground railway in London, where I find great difficulty in seeing the insignificant sign giving the name of the station because of the overwhelming mass of large and conspicuous signs of advertising concerns.

JOHN P. PETERS.

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH,
New York.

RECONCILIATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE.

THE process of adjustment between religious philosophy, Judaistic and Christian, and scientific philosophy has already covered a long period and is like to continue for many years. It has been fraught with much bitter controversy, and many are the misgivings as to the ultimate outcome. One may hear prophecies, on the one hand, of the extinction of religion and the triumph of science, and on the other hand, of the victorious revival of religious faith. The faint-hearted would stay the ark with anxious hands, as it seems to them to totter to its overthrow; others would drive unmindful of the stumbling oxen or the rocky road.

It is not difficult to discern the causes of the controversy. There lies behind it the assumption that the biblical writers were so inspired that whatever they said about the phenomena of nature must be used as true *in the sense prevailing at the time* in the discussions provoked by new discoveries. No attempt seems to have been made to ascertain in what sense these writers meant their statements. Their ideas oftentimes were as far from the current interpretation as that is from the present one.

The general consequence was that those whose business was the interpretation and advocacy of the Scriptures became advocates of the current explanation of natural phenomena, which they believed warranted by the Scriptures, and therefore opponents of the theories put forward by scientific men to include the newly observed phenomena of nature. Thereby religion obtained the reputation, wrongly enough, of being opposed to science. Even learned men, who should have known better, have adopted this unwarranted position, and have described, under such titles as "the conflict between religion and science," a conflict which they and their heedless followers created out of their own misconceptions.

Nor is the case much better when it is assumed that the conflict is one between theology and science, or even between ecclesiasticism and science. The accident that religious men were for a long time almost the only educated men brought them necessarily into the discussions. The conflict,

however, depended not so much upon their religious convictions, as upon the nature of their education, and the attitude of mind and mode of reasoning which it developed. That education which trains one to look upon the products of the human intellect, however noble and uplifted, not only as material to be appreciated and work to be emulated, but as truth to be believed, precedents to be followed, and limitations not to be overpassed, creates a mode of thinking which is diametrically opposed to that of science. Briefly, the education of the earlier periods may be characterized as that dependent on authority. It tended inevitably to produce minds willing to be limited by the thinking of the past and to follow precedent. When, therefore, the few who dared to reason independently propounded ideas contrary to current conceptions, a conflict between the two types was inevitable. Education was chiefly in the control of ecclesiastical organizations. The dominant education rested upon authority, and even appealed to the Scriptures as final authority in all matters which they touched. Upon the church, therefore, fell the odium of the conflict between the conservative and the radical, between authority and novelty.

Now, this type of education is by no means obsolete even today. In the earlier phases of a child's education he is inevitably, and not unwisely, trained to depend upon authority—the authority of the parent, of textbook, and of teacher. Unhappily many never go beyond this childish stage. Even the high school cannot dispense wholly with the method of authority, and many schools do not begin, even in the science courses themselves, to show pupils a more excellent way. Too often also the college fails to introduce the student to accurate observation and independent thinking. Far the strongest indictment against the mathematical-classical group of studies has been that they were so employed in education as to confirm the man in the childish dependence upon authority. Their traditional use and method had had this effect, and it was the rare teacher who broke away and used the classics, as they may be used, in the scientific spirit. That the normal effect of these methods is not universal may be inferred from the gradual rise of science and the increase in the number of its votaries.

As even yet much the greater number of even learned men have been trained to an overwhelming respect for authority, and as the less educated have had little or no opportunity for any other training, the conflict between authority and the scientific spirit continues to exist. But the center of the conflict has shifted somewhat. It is evident that the scientific method is rightly dominant, and it seems that authorities in religion and science *must* be "reconciled." One type of apologist seeks now to show that the allega-

tions of Scripture writers are consonant with the present conceptions of science. Shields's *Scientific Evidences of Revealed Religion* may be taken as an extreme type of an apologetic both futile and useless. The other endeavors to show how religious conceptions may be modified in the light of modern discoveries without loss to true religion.

For the people of any particular age or phase of development books of this sort are beyond doubt useful, if they correctly represent the two parties, Christianity and science. But it must never be forgotten that such efforts are foredoomed to failure if "reconciliation" is the object. The method of authority and the method of science are incompatible, and no wedlock, blessed though it be, will ever unite them. Science will move on and leave any "reconciliation" outgrown. Christianity is growing now, and ought to continue its development until it likewise invalidates the argument. Such books are therefore, in the very nature of things, ephemeral. Yet they may do a most useful even if transient service.

The work¹ by Professor Rice is surely one of the sanest and most helpful of its kind. In the first part our scientific progress is considered. In general, scientific progress is shown to be along three lines: the extension of the universe in space, the extension of the universe in time, and the unity of the universe. The author devotes attention with increasing fulness to each in turn. This portion of the work is indeed a history of the scientific discoveries which have affected religious belief. It constitutes more than two-thirds of the whole, and may be accepted as a clear, concise, readable, and generally accurate statement of the more important facts and theories of astronomy, geology, and biology. Here are discussed the antiquity of man, Genesis and geology, the evolution of the universe according to the nebular hypothesis, the evolution of the earth through geologic history, the evolution of living things and Darwin's contribution to our knowledge of it, with a final section on the theological bearings of evolution.

In the second part of the book one finds chapters on the personality of man and of God, law in nature (most commendable), providence, prayer, miracle, and revelation and the Bible. A brief third part considers the general status of "Christian evidences."

Two different sorts of people are likely to find fault with this book. One will be the Christian of a certain type; because it assumes as true many things about Christianity which he is unwilling to concede, and abandons many points of ancient doctrine which seem to him impregnable.

¹ *Christian Faith in an Age of Science*. By WILLIAM NORTH RICE. New York: Armstrong & Son, 1903. xii+425 pages, 15 figures.

He does not feel the force of the difficulties that beset his scientific brethren, and he considers any yielding as compromise with an enemy who ought to be resisted with a "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Such a man will say that the author asks simply an abandonment of historic Christianity and advocates a mongrel substitute of monistic philosophy, scientific rationalism, and pantheism—a religion Christian only by brevet.

The other critic will be the scientific man whose religious development has been dwarfed. He will point out some flaws even in the scientific portions; he will cavil at the discussions on providence, prayer, and miracle; will revile the author's evident faith as unfitting him for his task; and will demand rigid scientific proof of the fundamentals of Christianity as prerequisite to belief.

But the scientific man who seeks religious truth as he seeks truth in material fields will find here suggestions which may lead to fuller faith. Yet even he may feel constrained to withhold assent to some of Professor Rice's explanations, and, in default of adequate knowledge, many will prefer to suspend judgment entirely, only holding it sure that truth is in none of its parts at variance with itself. The Christian who has writhed before the unholy dilemma, "You must believe thus-and-so, or you are no Christian," will find from this book that even the most modern results of scientific study not only need not destroy faith, but may strengthen it. The theologian, if he reads with open mind, may get from it new ideas that will illuminate some philosophical recesses of doctrine. To all who want light on their faith we commend the book for thoughtful perusal and calm reflection.

But he who takes the book as a final word, be he who he may, will make a mistake which the author warns him against. It necessarily indicates only a line of thought for personal development, a *modus vivendi*, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, acquainted with the ways of God in the world.

Perhaps a passage of Professor Rice's own will be the best indication of the scope of his book.

We have traced the history of the great discoveries which have created the new intellectual atmosphere. The flat earth has rolled itself into a spheroid. The once steadfast earth spins in its orbit around a central sun. The heavenly bodies have stretched apart into measureless distances. The six thousand years of tradition have expanded into a duration immense if not eternal. Man himself, though his duration is but a moment in comparison with that of the universe,

claims an antiquity far beyond the traditional limit. The chaotic manifoldness of nature has given place to a threefold unity—a unity of substance, a unity of force, and a unity of process. All changes of matter, lifeless and living alike, are the expression of transformations of a stock of energy which suffers neither addition nor subtraction. From the nebula to man we find no break in the continuity of evolution. Meteors have clustered into suns and planets. The incandescent surface of the globe has wrinkled into continents and oceans. The simplest forms of life have developed in endless ramification into the varied species of plants and animals, till animal life has grown divine in man himself.

And we have recognized that these changes in our thought of the universe cannot but work corresponding changes in our thought of God and of his revelation to man. We have ceased to look to the Bible for a revelation of the plan and history of the universe, or to regard the Bible as inerrant. The “carpenter God” has vanished from a universe which we have come to regard as a growth and not as a building. The metaphysical dogma of the duality of essence in human nature has been rendered uncertain by the tendencies of biological science. Evolutionary anthropology must regard the fall of man as potential rather than actual. The tendencies of scientific thought have compelled us to reject as unhistoric some of the Biblical narratives of miracle, and to regard others as more or less doubtful.

Yet these changes of belief involve the abandonment of no essential doctrine of Christianity. A Heavenly Father, a risen Saviour, an inspired and inspiring Bible, an immortal hope, are still ours.

Such a book will surely be useful in its day, though neither those who reverence authority, nor those who doubt all things that they may know the more, are fully satisfied by it.

C. R. BARNES.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT RESTATED.¹

HERE are two books with essentially one theme, though separated in time of publication by but little more than a year. The former is a serious, elaborate, and learned discussion of some 330 pages; the latter is a series of three lectures apologetic of the position taken in its predecessor and somewhat, though not offensively, polemical. Ultra-conservative readers will welcome both, though they will find nothing new in either.

The purpose of these two books is to re-establish and reinforce the doctrine of the strictly substitutionary and propitiatory death of Christ,

¹ *The Death of Christ: Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament*, 1902. *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*, 1903. By JAMES DENNEY. New York: Armstrong & Son. 334 pages, \$1.50; 159 pages, \$1.